CHAPTER V

THE MICRO-LEVEL ANALYSIS OF DATA (II): THE HIDDEN CURRICULUM

5.0 Introduction

In the last chapter, we arrived at the first hypothesis of the study, which is that in the process of putting ER into practice, the value of ER is weakened by forces and constraints within the curriculum. This formulation was based on an analysis of ER theory in relation to the empirical data pertaining to objectives, assessment and the workings of the hidden curriculum of ER.

Having asserted that ER as realized in practice is different from ER as idealised in the syllabus, we need to examine in greater detail, the quality of ER in operation. This is the second Central Question of the study, that is to be examined in this chapter: what is the usefulness or relevance of the ER course especially for the low achiever in English? Corollaries to this question are: Should the ER course be deleted from or retained within the curriculum especially for the low achiever?

These questions are examined in this chapter under the following sub-headings (Dynamic sub-headings (2) Nos. 4, 5, 6; see 3.4.3).
1. Motivation (of Students) and the Usefulness of ER Course (Sub-heading No.4)

This section considers the general perceptions of the participants of the course regarding its usefulness for A, B and C stream students. In substantive terms, perceptions of usefulness means a sense of satisfaction that participants have for the course, to be gauged by marshalling the gains of the course; how ER helps in student development, rather than usefulness measured through marks or grades gained in a pre-test, post-test situation.

2. Streaming and its Effects on the Low Achiever (Sub-heading No.5)

Having examined the usefulness (or value) of the ER course, this section will highlight the contrast between A, B and C streams and will examine the usefulness of the course for the low achiever, or C streamer. Since the college in question does segregate students we will be focussing here on streaming and its effects on course construction and implementation and on the behaviour of the low achiever in English. We will in other words be looking at the course as it exists and its instructional worth to the C streamer.

3. ER and ER Pedagogy (Sub-heading No.6)

The instructional worth of ER, described as 'useful' in the initial stages for the low achiever in the previous section, focuses on ER pedagogy, which is clearly distinguished
in this section from the ER course itself. The ER pedagogy, which emerges through the T-Int and St-Int is formulated here, with special reference to the low achiever. This section will, in other words, look at the significance of a course in the curriculum, and will try to delineate what the means of this course could be in practice. The ER pedagogy proposed, comes from the grassroots level through the data, and reflects whatever relevance the ER course would hold for the low achiever. The researcher here, emerges as a catalytic force who helps in the articulation of solutions for ER, possible within the field.

Having discussed the usefulness of the ER course, specially in terms of the low achiever, in response to the second Central Question of the study this chapter concludes with a formulation of Hypothesis B.

5.1 The Motivation of the Student and the Usefulness of the ER Course

Usefulness, we have said is not seen in measurable terms, but in the quality of perceptions felt by the participants of the course, a sense of satisfaction perhaps on what relevance the course has for the student. Usefulness therefore is not defined in \textit{a priori} categories, but is rather whatever indications emerge through the sources being examined as data.
In looking at the usefulness of the course, the perspective of the study finally is a 'positive' one, i.e., one where the contributions of the course, can be formulated in advantageous terms. We are, as already we have said, marshalling the gains of the ER course in this section.

A summary of teacher perceptions (T-Int) and student perceptions (St-Int; St-Qn) will be followed by a general discussion.

5.1.1 Teacher Perceptions of the Usefulness of ER

To the question: (T-Int: 13) "Has ER made the students want to read further?" the reply of teachers was wary. Most of the answers were preceded by a 'well I'll be guessing' response. Only one teacher answered at once, "very few". Claiming that they do not have proof, the teachers go on to say:

1. That A stream and B stream students were reading anyway (T-11, T-7). One teacher says, "we are not motivating them. A and B are motivated anyway." Reading in English is "natural" for the upper streams (T-4).

2. C stream teachers say that "very few" are reading further (T-6). One teacher says that ER "may indirectly influence them, but we cannot categorically say it does" (T-3). Another teacher says that if the students were interested in reading,
they would, but that the students were not able to read and understand, so they cannot (T-2). A stronger response is: "They are not motivated to read, can't say it has helped them" (T-10).

3. Two positive reactions have come however, one from a B stream teacher who says that one-third of his students have expressed the urge to read more, and from a C stream teacher who says that students do read more in English.

In general, most teachers are unwilling therefore to commit themselves on the possible usefulness of the course, on whether it has affected students in "positive" terms. Why are teachers wary about committing themselves on this topic of the usefulness of the course? The possible reasons for this could be teacher unwillingness or inability to put out the time:

(i) to look for effects of a course. This would require a tedious follow-up of students for overloaded teachers; an activity outside the prescribed limits of a course;

(ii) to think out criteria for judging the usefulness of a course; and because of this
(iii) to think out the objectives and goals of ER. Perhaps teacher models of reading which in ER instructional strategies did not include the independent nature of reading as a goal, is not able to see the subsequent larger goals and purposes of it.

It is clear that where objectives have had some sort of follow-up, teachers have been able to say more specifically what the effects of the course are.

5.1.2 Student Perceptions of the Usefulness of ER

The parallel question, asked of the student in the questionnaire (St-Qn: 9). "Has ER made you want to read more?" - though difficult to answer while undergoing the experience of the course, drew a 60% response to "Yes to an extent", while only about 28% answered "yes" and about 8% answered "No".

There seems to be then, some definite use perceived by students.

1. This information was corroborated by St-Ints. In what specific ways is the usefulness of the course perceived by students? St.11 says that the ER course is a chance for many students to read a complete book for the first time. This experience has been attested to by many students; without ER, students it is claimed, would not read (St.11 and St.7).
2. ER has helped in language development. It has given them "a chance to speak", "use words and vocabulary", to "communicate in English - a new experience", "have learnt to speak", "helped in speaking and listening to lectures."

It must be pointed out that this positive response is one entirely emanating from C streamers. It demonstrates that for the C streamer at least the ER course is a means for language development.

3. More non-committal or negative answers also exist. For example, "useful, but I'm not interested ", and "its not useful - I was reading anyway ", "should have proper discussions ", and "total eyewash.".

Which students hold these opinions? Interestingly, it is the A and B streamers, the better students who hold these opinions. However motivating the large book-lists are for higher achievers, there does not seem to be a justification for the course for these students.

Why is there this difference? Perhaps the answer lies in how students stand in relation to reading itself. An analysis of questions regarding reading habit development (Q.No.1-3, 6, 7) on library reading in schools (Q.No.4) throw light on the picture. Though some teachers feel that
students cannot understand and read in English (T-2, T-10), all the students claim to like reading in general and reading in English. In fact 20% claim that they do not read a second language-St-Qn: 3). 80% do, however, and of these, 75% moreover read slower in English (in their perception).

In the face of this overwhelming positive response to reading and reading in English, the problem seems to be one of quality. The question is, how well do students read in English?

One reason why C streamers are more positive, could be because C streamers have had different reading experiences/

What were the previous reading experiences of students? In response to (St-Qn: 4) the question, "Did you have libraries in school?" we get the interesting information that, while all the A stream students did have library work experience at school, most C stream students did not.

This difference might partly account for the positive attitude C streamers have for the ER course. Few opportunities to read even one complete book (in English) accounts for the sense of new experience that many students get with the course. It points to the value of ER for the low achieving student, namely the need to develop the habits of reading. There is obviously a need here that tertiary learning systems can provide - an opportunity for the experience of reading. This 'opportunity' is nothing to the more privileged student, who has come from good schools with library facilities, as well as from home backgrounds where reading in English, and reading in general, perhaps, occur as a matter of course.
The value of the course as it now stands, therefore, is more clearly felt by the C stream students, who find it useful (S-Int: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12). It will be recalled (4.2.4) that it is the C stream students who seemed to want stronger frames in classroom interaction. B stream students and A stream students on the other hand do not find it so useful. Both groups suggested positive changes, whereby the course could be made more valuable.

What these A stream and B stream students say (St-Int 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19) in fact is an incipient ER pedagogy, voiced by the students (see 5.3.2). They want to be guided in reading processes (St-Int -15) on what to do with a book (St-Int -18) to "broaden thinking". The interaction of teacher and students in discussion is held as important in educative terms (St-Int -19); besides a richer selection, books on vocabulary, joke-books etc. (St-Qn -7 and St-Int) are wanted.

However, it is interesting that, in spite of criticism, and suggestions for change, there is a strong plea for keeping the ER programme as it is (St-Qn 12); 65% of the students do not want changes while about 15% do. It could be that students cannot conceive of other options. In any case, there is a discrepancy here. Even teachers - 80% of them want changes - why do the students who are so critical of the course not want it also?
Why is there this discrepancy? The teachers want modifications primarily in book selection, rather than with motivation, evaluation and any other element. When talked to, the students also express their ideas on what they would like to read - authentic texts instead of simplified in some cases (T-4, T-11, T-5; St-15, 18). Perhaps the hidden curriculum here, for the students publicly not admitting to wanting any change at all/though St-Ints in fact show that they do want them, could be because (a) as S-13 put it though the programme is a failure because it does not fulfil its objectives (of improving the 'conceptual' level), to ask for change, would only give the students more work, and that it was felt, was not desirable. This student's actual objective was to complete the course, as easily as possible - i.e., in B stream, where he said he took care to enter and remain. Present arrangements need not be unsettled for the students since they do not know what changes would entail in terms of work, which needs to be done because of assessment. So though students say that they want the course kept as it is, the suggested changes that come from them, make us believe that students do want some changes, though they would like ER to be retained as a subject - another way of saying that the students do see some value in the course. In fact, only one teacher, and two students would like to delete the ER course from the curriculum.
5.1.3 **Comparison of Teacher-Student Perceptions**

Whether the course is useful to the students or not, has been answered initially in a tentative way by the teachers. The teachers are not very sure, especially about A and B streams. (The students are reading anyway, so how are we helping?)

There are some teachers of C stream however who are sure that the students are reading more in English. The students themselves are more positive about the course. However there is a clear distinction in student reaction/the course between A, B and C streams.

A and B streams think ER is useful in a general way, but say that the course could be improved. There is an overall feeling, however, that the course should not be changed. One reason is that the students have adjusted themselves to the set pattern and do not want to waste more time with the course. Also, if grades are easily available, then there does not seem to be too much point in bringing about changes that might bring less returns. It is not in the student's interests therefore to voice complaints too loudly.

However, suggestions for A stream ER programme improvements were proposed. T-6 suggests that A stream should be introduced to texts they do not normally read. This is suggested by the students also.
Though some A stream students and teachers do not see much point in the course for A stream, therefore (since A streamers and B streamers read anyway), there is no doubt however that an ER course for these students cannot be deleted from the curriculum. A revision of course objectives, of evaluation, of skills delineation (understanding what ER involves), a re-defining of the teacher's role with regard to ER, could all point to valuable material for a defensible ER pedagogy for the A stream and B stream. Provided the structure (and this importantly includes who the decision-makers are) of the course changes, therefore, there could be some usefulness of the ER course.

But what of C stream? Most C stream students find the course useful. They have described the usefulness of the course in terms of means of the ER course. For many C streamers, the ER course means steps to language proficiency. For many the ER course has been their first opportunity for reading.

It could be said that the ER course, as it stands, has some instructional value therefore for the low achiever, and not for the high achiever. This generalisation as we shall now see, needs some modification in the light of the picture emerging from the statements of III semester C stream students.
An analysis and observation of a III Semester C stream Class (A-10) showed that in comparison to the zeal and interest portrayed by the 1st semester C stream teachers and students, there is a strong sense of disillusionment, boredom and disinterest in the 3rd semester C stream classes. The change in motivation between C streams in the first and third semesters, is remarkable, and has been commented on by several teachers (T-12, T-10, T-2). It would seem that the motivation of C stream students in the third semester, has been severely affected by the workload, by linguistic difficulties, by the selection of books etc.

One case, however, gave some clues to the hidden curriculum operating here. The researcher observed a lethargic semester III, C stream class, in the first half of the year. In the second half of the year, a student interviewed from the same class (St.14) said that the class was much happier in the second semester, and that this was because a new 'contract' had seemed to have been arrived at between the students and the new teacher, whereby evaluation questions were asked only on the written synopsis or required summary, and not on any other part of the text. This teacher (T-4) had, it seems, accepted the contradictions inherent in assessment and ER and had negotiated a certain contract with the students. Here, the students are participating in a real sense, in what they want and need. A lack of negotiation leads to student unrest and resentment. Says Colin Hunter (1980: 219-220):
... participation is still a guiding concept in the theoretical and official aims of schooling. The question remains how this ideal can be held at the 'intention' level, while maintaining the basically paternalistic and authoritarian control system.

Andrew Pollard (1980) offers a model for the emergence of strategies (i.e., coping strategies of the teacher are developed). He points to a parallel student coping strategy mechanism, which needs to arrive at a "working consensus" with teacher strategies:

... open conflict can be taken to indicate the lack of teacher-coping strategy which is acceptable to pupils; acceptable, that is, in the sense of allowing them room for their own adaptive coping strategies, since any stable agreement must provide for the survival of both parties. (1980:46)

An effective instructional programme needs therefore negotiation between two parties for a contract or "a working consensus," if the contradictions already described in the syllabus are to be resolved in any effective way. The contract between the teacher and students in A-9 for example is - that the teacher asks, "which story did you like?" and the student answers the question, with the story all prepared (A-9; see 4.2). Any deviation from this pattern is resisted by the students. The "working consensus" is a way for the students to cope with assessment, which has been described in 4.2, as being central for the course under study.
In a situation where the language used and the knowledge required is teacher-determined, students establish their 'rights' in the classroom, in 'subversive' ways. This takes longer for the C streamer, who manages this only by semester III, but is quickly effected for the A streamer. Teacher resistance to student 'bargaining' of this sort, is active however, against the C streamers working consensus - there are few constructive changes made to respond to it. Whereas the A streamer's resistances, more vocal and aggressive, have been quickly placated with longer reading lists, best sellers etc., changes for C stream are being effected only this year and these changes are, moreover, moving towards more teacher control: compulsory texts and examinations on texts. In our observation it is clear, however, that both groups, the III semester C streams, and the A streams disturb the equilibrium of teachers to an extent. While the A streamers lay down terms in Semester I itself, the C streamer, coping with linguistic difficulties can only do so by Semester III.

There is a need for students to be given more say in more overt and decision-making ways. This will lessen the need for 'bargains' that do not hold learning as 'central'. If student-centred learning operates in a fundamental sense (Theory I, see 2.2.2 particularly) then energy that goes into student resistances could be channelised into organising what they
want to learn and thinking out as adults, what exactly they need. A relevant course is essential, but a relevant course becomes one only with active student participation. There needs to be a collaboration, then, between students and teachers.

Conclusion

The usefulness of the ER course for the low-achieving student, is perceived at the initial stages. This is mainly because the low achiever is struggling with a language with which he is unfamiliar and which has become the medium of instruction. At later stages, the course would need more negotiation with students, when the contracts the student wants to make become stronger, less directly linked with learning and more directly linked with course requirements. By this time the student can cope only with marks, and not with language learning. This process could be described as a demand for a weakening of 'frames'. There should therefore be a change of structure in terms of decision-making (from the one described in the case) at later stages i.e., when the second semester of instruction is arrived at.

The value for the high achieving student however, is negligible, given the course as it exists, since the A streamer is reading anyway, regardless of the ER course. But a change of ER pedagogy (to be discussed in 5.3) arrived at through a 'bottoms-up' process (and hence in terms of content, not predictable) would/might infuse a significance to the ER course.
for the high achiever also. This virtually means, again, that value is attributed to a course which has again, active student participation in decision-making and course formation.

What has been described in this section is the usefulness of the course in learning terms, in spite of course constraints that develop student resistances and behaviour. That is, we have looked at the course as it has been realized.

5.2 Streaming and the Low Achiever in English

The preceding analysis of data, has referred to the differences apparent in A, B, C streams in relation to Objectives and ER, Assessment and Pleasure in Reading, the Self-Selection of Texts, and the Value of ER.

This section attempts to give a coherence to an important part of the study, the low achiever in English and the effect of the ER course on the low achiever (i.e., the usefulness of the course for the low achiever). This is done by pulling together what has already been found of the low achiever and ER, and by adding whatever else the data affords under this head. In partial response to Central Question B, therefore, this section focuses specifically on ER and its usefulness for the low achiever.

What is Streaming? : The students are divided into A, B, C streams at the beginning of the 1st semester, according to the results of a placement test. This test has been developed
by the college itself, and it examines students' grammar and
discourse abilities.

Streaming according to language ability is a strategy
used to develop students at their own levels, so that common
student problems can be dealt with in class. Thus A stream
is good, B is middling and C is poor, according to test
ratings. In keeping with research findings (Lacey, 1978;
Ball, 1986), the A stream students are usually English medium
students in school, whereas the C stream students are usually
those who have studied in the vernacular. Since English
medium schools are generally 'élite' institutions, those who
do not manage to get into them, are usually children from working
class, or lower middle class homes. There are of course
exceptions.

The college has different requirements for each stream.
Thus, A and B streams have to work for fewer semesters. A
two
stream gets four credits in 2 semesters; B stream gets six
credits in three and C stream gets eight credits in four
semesters.

How does the phenomenon of streaming affect those put
into a low stream? In this chapter, we will examine streaming
and the perceptions of teacher and the student, a short
discussion on the use of the mother tongue for the C streamer
in the ER assessment session, and finally a discussion on the
merits and demerits of streaming and its implications for the
low achiever.
5.2.1 Teacher Perception of C Stream

What are teacher expectations of the C streamer? We have shown in 4.3 that the expectations of A stream teachers (those who teach A stream alone, or A and C streams but who are more concerned with A stream) of C streamers are less realistic than those of a few C stream teachers (who teach C stream and seem more concerned with C stream) in that these C stream teachers see that the students are capable of a great deal (T-9, T-12, T-6; T-5; B stream). Most teachers in general see C streamers as problem cases, not coming up to set teacher expectations. It would appear that focusing on upper groups, blocks an interest and awareness of lower groups; there seems to be an automatic contrast being made between the high and low achiever, to the low achiever's disadvantage.

The problem of setting teacher objectives *a priori* to classroom interaction would partly account for teacher dissatisfaction of students, particularly low achievers. 4.1 discusses how the C stream student's objectives are not those of the teacher. This is not information that is recognised and used by the teacher.

In 4.2 it is demonstrated that the C streamers are asked detailed questions that are demanding of recall abilities, and that they receive less of an ER experience than A and B
stream students. In 4.3, we have shown how the C streamer has very little choice of reading texts. Further, the C streamer has to rely only on about four adapted or simplified texts, linguistically graded, but with no consideration for cultural or personal schemas.

Further, less time, money and attention goes to reading lists of the C stream. Teachers feel that students do not know how to choose, that they know no English, so resort to book covers, size of print and volume etc.

Such teacher expectations effectively distance the C streamer from Theory I, which is considered optimal for ER experience and development. This distancing is far greater for the C streamer than for the A and B streams.

The C streamer has therefore qualitatively different experiences of the ER Course - different from those of A and B streamers.

1. Teacher expectations are different
2. Reading experiences (texts, IR pedagogy) are different
3. Requirements (credits, exams, compulsory texts) are different.
What do teachers think of streaming?

All teachers and most students like the streaming of students into A, B, C streams, according to language ability. Though the streaming process 'misfires' occasionally in the sense that a student is obviously not in the class suitable to his 'level' (St.14, 13), it is a process that generally does divide the students who studied in English medium from those who studied in their mother tongues in school.

But on the whole, teachers and students seem to be in agreement here, that they are happy with 'streaming'. Why are teachers happy? Though teachers are aware of the philosophical and sociological arguments against streaming, the factor of large classes and an overwhelming student population for whom English is a compulsory subject, makes it difficult for the teacher to cope with an unstreamed heterogeneous class. As one teacher puts it, the advantages of streaming is that:

1. From the management point of view - one can 'cope'.

2. The teacher is no longer a policeman on a platform; with streaming - a more personalised pedagogy is possible.

3. Since group work was not used in large classes before streaming, the heterogeneous quality of classes were not exploited anyway. and therefore little benefits have been lost, with streaming (T-5).
Course management and administration seem to be top priority for the teacher in appreciating streaming. As one teacher said, "unless there is streaming, the teacher and student will not benefit" (T-2). It is considered most economical in terms of time (T-9), because the teacher finds it easier to simplify language. An A stream teacher says, "streaming is a must. Students are comfortable and understand jokes" (the teacher's presumably). There is also time for explanations (T-11).

The priority of course management shares equal status, however, with what perceptions teachers have of the students' opinions of streaming for the justification of it. Quite correctly (as our analysis corroborates), the teacher feels that students "love streaming". As quoted above, the teachers feel that the students are benefitted and are comfortable. Two teachers (T-3, T-2) say that B stream students ask to be put down into C stream. And as one teacher put it, "in a heterogeneous mass, these fellows will be miserably lost."

The question why students, especially C streamers, like streaming is not really thought about or discussed by the teacher. The security of being with your own kind is indisputable, but the problem remains: the streaming situation, reflective of society, ensures a continuation of divisions, so that even after college, many students will be (perhaps) even more 'miserably lost in a heterogeneous mass'.
To some teachers, the purpose of streaming is salutory. One teacher, admitting that streaming "reflects society" says that it need not continue to do so. "We start with where they are and make them come up to the standards of A." The Teacher (T-6), is "happy for the way it (streaming) works", not "for the sociological effects". Bringing C stream up to is the level of A stream, however, at the same time/recognised to be only a hope, and a non-realistic objective (T-9). Interestingly, only one teacher talks of the "inferiority feelings" of the students, and this teacher is speaking of the III Semester C streamer. It would seem that the teachers' own sense of coping with a large class, of being heard better (jokes, simple language, time-bound schedules) are the priorities in streaming. Referring to student appreciation of streaming, without reference to the reason 'why' students like streaming, covers up crucial resistances rendering them inaccessible for examination, thus continuing streaming which is beneficial to the teacher.

5.2.2 The Student on Streaming

Why do students like streaming?

Practically all the students claim to like streaming (St-Qn: 20, 21a, 21b). But why do they do so? If we scratch the seemingly 'happy' surface presented in straightforward responses to questions, it can be demonstrated that again, there is a dynamic hidden curriculum in operation here in
relation to the ER Course, that is not accessed (not productively, at least) according to the data, by the teacher/head of department/college administration. The perceptions that students have of each other is interesting. Students 3, 4 and 5 in a joint interview told the researcher that the B stream students were having a "tough time" whilst they, in the C stream were finding it easy to get marks. This opinion was presented to the students in the interviews, and the responses were as follows:

St. 13 (B stream) felt that to say a higher stream was tough was a form of "consolation." Having said this, he said that it had been his choice to do his placement test in such a way, that he was put into B stream (and not A stream). "So I made stupid mistakes - Suppose if I put 'and' instead of 'on' I put 'in' and all that ..." He also (with his friends) took care never to show enough improvement to get into A stream. This was because A stream was reputed to be "real tough" requiring more work, with less credits, thus necessitating taking optional courses for which there were inconvenient timings, "you have to come at 3.30 or come at 8.30". To be in C stream "from the prestige point of view, I don't think I like it ..." (St.13). There is a bit of circularity in this argument. Other students, however, said quite simply that they would like to be in higher streams (St-Int 9), St.14: "We feel inferior"; St.12, would like to move upward.
The majority of C stream boys, however, wish to remain where they are (Sts. 1-8, 10, 11, 13 of B and C streams). The reasons given are that "my standard is low" (St. 7), "because grammar is taught" (St. 8); "because it is easy to make high grades" (Sts. 3, 4, 5, 6).

It is interesting, however, that the A stream students are hardly aware of the lower stream students whereas the lower streams are constantly aware of and sometimes frustrated in the comparisons made. "The attitude of teachers are different to C stream ..." (St. 14). And, as one A stream student said, "We don't come across them (C stream students) much."

It would seem that the educational experience of an A stream student is singularly different from that of a C streamer's, in that the C streamer is bearing an additional load of comparisons, and a sort of segregation which does not allow him to break out of his given 'mould'.

What are the other differences? Our analysis (Chapter IV) gave some information about C stream, in relation to Objectives and ER Theory, Pleasure and Assessment and Self-selection of Texts (Theory I) from which as we said in the last section, the C streamer is distanced further than the A streamer from ER.
4.1 (Objectives and ER Theory) discusses the following distinctions between A, B and C streams. Asking for discussion, negotiation, freedom to choose and exercising a deliberate choice (St.13 remaining in B stream), are seen more overtly in A and B streams than in C streams. It would seem that the high achievers in English have the articulatory skills, that help them to recognise needs and wants and to make bids for them. Though they already have a course that has the potential of being a really enjoyable one, (a changing book-list, including best sellers, discussion of issues, no exams) it is significant that their unease and dissatisfaction is being more clearly described by teachers and students than that of the C stream students.

The C stream students resort to more covert and inarticulate ways of coping with dissatisfactions. As pointed out in 4.1 the C stream student has changed the objectives of the ER course, so that the means towards proficiency in the language is predominant. Though there is less scope for enjoyment (a limited number of classics, examinations, no choice, compulsory texts) there seems very little in the way of specific complaints being voiced (aside from the foreign names constantly referred to) though the observation of the apathy of a III semester C stream group, equalled that of no other class. It would seem that the ways of demanding changes are just as (if not more) powerful in C stream as in A stream - though
the 'modality' used to express them is different. Their silence in criticism however is taken, it would seem, for lack of it.

Another difference observed is that the high achievers are able to describe what might be specific solutions to problems - almost all the student interviews with A and B streams showed that the students had thought about where they stood in relation to the course. These opinions were asserted moreover with confidence.

The C stream students, on the other hand, did not assert concrete suggestions for the improvement of the course so confidently. Nevertheless, as already noted, the C streamers' 'operational' objectives though not made or held assertively, and consciously, is held and acted upon in a covert but dynamic way.

In 4.2 (Assessment and Pleasure in Reading) shows the following distinction between A, B and C streams. It can be asserted in the light of the previous discussion that the C streamer has changed the course for himself. And he, too, sees where he stands in relation to the course (as indeed does the high achiever as well) by reacting badly to a 'contract' he holds as unfeasible (being questioned on books he cannot read) and reacting more positively to one he can work with (answering questions based on his own written synopsis). The
C streamer, however, unlike the A streamer, has to work harder to assert his criteria for the assessment game being played. He, unlike the A streamer, has still not basically achieved a mastery over the language forms, and hence would not be able to cope with a situation where unpredictable discussion and conversational strategies would be expected. Therefore stronger 'frames' are required by the C streamer. And an IR pedagogy is in a way easier for him, in the assessment situation.

The criteria established by the C streamer, moreover, takes a longer time to be established - i.e., by Semester III, when the A streamer has already completed his credits for the ER course. These criteria, moreover, are not related to learning, or reading but to acquiring marks. The assessment system is totally controlling the course at this stage.

The overwhelming response for streaming, at least for C stream students would be perhaps, that a delicate bargaining system has been set up, which if diffused by better students might prove the establishment of criteria more difficult and time-consuming. This is in the nature of speculative interpretation, given the data and our observation of the classroom. Students in interviews, claimed that it was easy to get good grades - distinction in C, whereas B stream students were really struggling, with more difficult books. The 'easy'
quality of work in C stream was stressed by many students (St-Int - C stream). This seems to be a major factor in the satisfaction found with the lower streams, the reason perhaps why students 'love' being in C stream in the perception of teachers (T-2). Only one student interviewed moreover (St.14) claimed dissatisfaction with the system - significantly this was a literature student.

In the analyses on Self-Selection (4.3) the following observations were made of C streamers: C stream students cannot select books on their own, "they don't know" (T-2). We assert that all readers have an in-built ability to discard or choose according to an inherent comprehension capability within. This means that 'comprehensible input' is arrived at by the reader, and cannot be imposed from outside by a teacher-selector/materials-writer.

Why do teachers say that C streamers cannot choose? The main reason proffered is that their linguistic competence is low, and therefore they do not understand whether a text is linguistically easy or difficult (T-2). This argument, however, sees reading primarily in linguistic terms, and outside the reader. Hence it imposes a standard of difficulty, which is gauged outside the reader, and by the teacher. If the model of reading was an interactive one, the interaction between the reader and text would be recognised and difficulty would be seen to be judged by the reader and the reader alone.
The fact is that, if C stream students cannot choose, it is because few opportunities to choose have come their way. Previous educational experiences have not offered opportunities to these students to exercise a learner choice or autonomy. Our analysis shows that few C stream students have had experiences of library reading, for example. Many students have not had libraries in the schools they went to. English medium students, more 'élite' and privileged (1) have had access to libraries at home and at school, (2) and have a well-developed English language repertoire by the time they come to college.

Our point is, that it is not therefore any intrinsic lack that the C streamer has that s/he cannot choose, but that educational situations have not granted him/her enough opportunities to develop an autonomy in learning (reflected in the ability to choose books, in this case). Our study shows, however, that instead of attributing causes for student failure to perform, primarily onto these external causes, the students themselves are seen to be at fault. Moreover any solutions being arrived at to cope with the problem of the C streamer, is actually reactionary and regressive from the point of view of student autonomy, with the introduction of compulsory texts and end-of-semester examinations. These factors, applied only to the C streamer, take away from whatever autonomy the student already has in the course. It is likely that the in-built abilities of selecting, of articulating and identifying consciously one's comprehension level, what is needed as opposed to what is liked etc., are abilities that
are not going to be developed in the C streamer at the tertiary level. Instead, by concentrating on teaching grammar, or requiring a detailed knowledge of content, in approaching learning as input = output, the student is not developing autonomy, not 'getting marks' and hence getting discouraged and losing the will to learn.

Any change in the fate of the C streamer in ER depends a great deal therefore on the perceptions held on the C streamer, and a realistic understanding of reading in relation to him or her.

5.2.3 How Much Use of English in ER?

The language of the C streamer in school at the secondary level is the mother tongue (MT) or any language other than English which is comparably still unfamiliar at the tertiary level (Tamil is the mother tongue of most of the students, though there are other languages like Oriya, Malayalam and Hindi). Should English be used in ELT programmes and in discussing ER texts? If so, to what extent? This question, of prime importance for a C streamer, has been discussed and thought out by the teacher, who being the one who (within the teacher-dominated paradigm) decides in which language discussion should proceed, uses the M.T in varying degrees.
The analysis regarding mother tongue use, shows an awareness on the teacher's part that it is comprehension and not language that was being tested. Most of the teachers permitted the use of the mother tongue in the oral assessment sessions. There were however two exceptions among the teachers who were adamant on the use of English in the English classroom. Both teachers did not themselves have Tamil as a mother tongue which might account for their opinion. Qualitatively, however, their reactions were different - one just could not think of it, the other was highly articulate on the need to exploit the opportunity for using English in interaction.

What is the best solution?

T-3 reports that the students in his group are the weakest in the C stream. But through use of the mother tongue, in evaluation, the teacher seemed to be able to say whether the students had really read the book or not. Indeed, the interests of many students in what they were reading was clearly obvious in their evaluation sessions, when they spoke to the teacher in the mother tongue. T-9, and T-6 encouraged English, though the mother tongue could be resorted to in cases of extreme need. The use of English in T-9's class was particularly impressive. The students spoke laboriously but clearly in English throughout, struggling but persisting in the language. Indeed, so well was English used, that the
researcher felt that some students could have learnt their answers by heart, but the teacher denied this, saying that "searching questions" were being asked. T-6 used Tamil as "an entry point into the discussion". T-2's class had a similar showing. But like T-10's class, this was a third semester C stream group.

T-10's class (C stream, Semester III), on the other hand, was not very forthcoming. They were hesitant about replies, but this might have been because the books had not been read, and because the class was generally uninterested in the books, or (and this is highly probable), it could have been that the use of the mother tongue was not allowed.

Conclusion

It seems useful, in the early stages for the teacher to at least understand the mother tongue of students. There seems to be a great let-up of anxiety among C stream students, if the mother tongue is allowed in evaluation sessions. To insist on the use of English in discussion/evaluation sessions is forcing a language use that is counter-productive. Thus, when the C stream students were asked whether they had ever been misunderstood by the teacher in evaluation sessions, the students (St-Int 2, 8, 10) said that there was no danger of that since they could always resort to Tamil. To allow the mother tongue in this situation, is to lessen student anxiety in evaluation
besides allowing students the chance to use more and more English, at his or her own pace, as confidence increases with which familiarity increasing familiarity with the language, is a result of opportunities for the active use of English.

5.2.4 The Effect of Streaming on the C Stream Student

We can here, sum up our discussion on the C streamer and streaming. Most students and teachers prefer the streaming of classes. In this way, it is felt, both teachers and students benefit. How do teachers benefit? The data shows that the teacher is happy with streaming not for academic but primarily for organisational reasons, of coping with large groups of students in more manageable ways. Further, reasons like economy of time in explanation, and communicating jokes and so on, indicate that where teacher talk is fundamental in classroom activity, streaming is certainly facilitating.

If, however, there was more interaction, less teacher talk, more student participation and group discussions, for example, a mixed ability grouping would be highly facilitative of this type of classroom organisation. Streaming, it is suggested, supports teacher control.

Why do students prefer streaming? The St-Int indicate that for students it is easier to negotiate contracts, and that for students it is more comfortable to be within a manageable linguistic 'level'.
However, where students feel they are in the wrong stream, or where students feel humiliated to be in a lower stream, we see that streaming is not always a 'happy thing'.

Though the fact of streaming, therefore, is not in conflict with Theory II of this college, and though students, teachers and the institution are by and large happy with streaming, we can say that the reasons for this preference, are it seems extra-academic, organisational and political in nature and reveal streaming as not the best organisational principle for developing language and ER.

The operational advantages of these factors, we hold, need to be questioned. Why is this so? There are reasons, academic and sociological in nature, to offset the operational advantages. In academic terms, streaming hinders the development of student autonomy which has an intrinsic value. For with streaming, the teacher is the only real resource person in a class and hence very little peer interaction is possible. Class discussions, if any, will usually be a teacher-to-student interaction. Further, small group discussions in English will not take place without student leaders to facilitate group dynamics.

What then is the solution? Having mixed-ability grouping would be helpful if there was a greater student participation. In the classes observed, since the ER evaluation session does
not seem to generally include group work (though in one or two cases it does), some access to A stream students seems desirable and feasible. One student comments on this (St.9): "In C streams there is no students are speaking - only mother tongue - they are not speaking" (St.9 - C stream).

Does the ER programme bring the students upto the level of A streamers? Though English courses do improve the students' command over the language, it does not mean that an 'equalisation' with A stream standards is effected. Nor is equalisation necessarily optimal. English medium students do not necessarily have a command over the language; as with many native speakers a fluency in language use, is not careful or effective language use. Often clichés, hackneyed phrases and trite expressions abound.

The C streamer is on par with the working class child described in the sociology of education and in sociology, (e.g. Bernstein, 1974; Rosen, 1986; Ball, 1986) in that English medium schools are generally 'élite' establishments for the middle class, and something to strive towards.

Our English medium school or convent school is a status symbol not generally open or accessible to the lower middle class. Since the working class in India is largely illiterate, the C stream student is either a first generation learner, or from the lower middle classes, someone who does not have access
to English medium schools. To talk of bringing the C streamer upto the A streamer's level, would be a parallel situation that Bernstein has been accused of when he discussed elaborated and restricted codes. It would seem that the struggle of the teacher is one which looks at the C streamer as lacking something; of not coming up to standard. In short, it is a subscribing to the 'deficit theory' in the sociology of education, which will always look at the underprivileged as inadequate against an upper class norm, decided in teacher-dominated frameworks. To have a goal which brings some students upto the level of another will always be unfair therefore to those found inadequate of the norm.

In sociological terms, therefore, there is a danger of perpetuating social differences with streaming. "The D-streamer will behave like a D-streamer" it is said.

once allocated, children tend to take on characteristics expected of them and the forecasts of ability made at the point of streaming are to this extent self-fulfilling.

(Douglas, 1964:147 in Ball, 1986:90)

The 'self-fulfilling prophecy' where the child, given an image, internalises the judgement and behaves accordingly, sets up a vicious cycle from where entry to other streams are difficult (Delamont, 1980; Ball, 1986). It would seem then
that academic behaviour is determined by organisation as is social behaviour. Friendship choices are commonly made within streams - we have noted how the A and C streamers do not mix socially. This is also attested to in the literature (Hargreaves, 1967; quoted in Ball, 1986) where streaming produces a polarized structure among pupils and affects social relationships (Ball, 1986). Not only does streaming allocate the distribution of initial life-chances to pupils, its standards and rules produce an arena, where the middle classes are at home and the working class are strangers (Woods, 1979). Streaming produces 'institutionalised sub-worlds', further, and this has been demonstrated in the data.

The C stream student emerges as having had fewer opportunities for library use, as well as fewer years of learning in English. Many are first-generation learners, without a home atmosphere supportive of university learning requirements.

Such students are given a different course from more privileged ones. However, though they are given a different treatment, the input into their course is, in terms of allocation of funds, availability of books, choice of books offered, much less than those offered to A stream students (see 4.3).

The perception the teachers have of these students is not always very high. Some teachers insist that they are bright, others that they are "muffs" or "intellectually poor"
students (T-Int). Many teachers do not commit themselves either way. But the C stream are generally considered as 'cases' for special treatment.

The setting up of teacher-dominated standards in the first place, then a disregard for the hidden curriculum which operates as resistances and counter-bargaining systems in the second place, do not see the C streamer as anything beyond 'not good' or 'muffs'. If in addition to an impoverished reading experience in school, a further impoverished course is given in college, it would seem that the situation is one which is described in the literature of the sociology of education as one which continues the status quo.

Instead of norms against which 98% of low achievers will necessarily fail, it would be more productive, it would seem, to encourage active learner participation in ER and indeed in any language development course. Such active learner participation contributes towards the deployment of language, and hence to its acquisition.

The suggestions for student participation, in decision-making and in classroom discussion, eschews the notion of a teacher-dominated standard, and supports one which encourages the student's language whatever it might be. Only out of this encouragement, will growth take place and not stifle; only through language use will acquisition be facilitated. The question of a learner-based approach, though simple in description, is not so in practice, in that it affects each
individual, and every role-relationship prevalent in class. Indeed with the C streamer, learner autonomy is more than liberalising the student to operate on his own; it means an acceptance of the C streamer for what s/he can contribute to learning (of others, and of his own).

What ER pedagogy is possible, according to the data to incorporate these shifts in role-relationships? This aspect will be discussed in the next section.

5.3 ER and ER Pedagogy

In Chapter II, we discussed the importance of instruction and schooling, as being often the only opportunity for learning provided for learners. First generation learners especially, should have much value from schooling. It is crucial therefore that schooling is not exploitative or dominating in nature, and is not a means of preventing the development of learner autonomy.

Though ER is a private activity, therefore, it can be opportunities for developing ER as a goal, and for using ER as a means. (The latter aspect is more clearly recognised by students than teachers.)

In the light of the participatory methodology already discussed we need to think of ER pedagogy and its methodology
as a collaboration between participants. This would maximally facilitate learning. In this section, we will examine the suggestions for an ER pedagogy, that emerged through the data. This is an important concept, that was not a priori expected as such, to 'emerge' the way it did. But when it did, it did so in rich and operational terms, since it came from the 'grass-roots' level (teacher and students and classroom).

The pedagogy of ER is a phrase which emerged in discussion with a teacher (T-5). This discussion pin-pointed the hitherto all-pervasive school bias of intensive reading on all reading activity in classrooms. This was demonstrated in our analysis by the types of questions asked of students in evaluation sessions. Though there are questions that ask the student to imagine something e.g., to read similar books; though there is an attempt to take the student beyond the text, a clear concept of what ER means in the curriculum has still to emerge.

A skeleton of a possible pedagogy did emerge however in the T-Int. Though all teachers saw ER as being of crucial importance, the hows, and whys were not consistently developed and analysed. Individually, however, the teachers' interviews brought out a theory of ER in the curriculum. The 'emerging' of the ER pedagogy, points to a crucial
factor in the research design, the position of the researcher herself, which is that of a catalyst, which activates and liberates the incipient teacher's syllabus and teacher's theorising present in every teacher (to be discussed further in Chapter VI).

The discussion between the teacher and the researcher (T-Int) yielded suggestions under the following heads:

1. Structural changes - organisational
2. Methodological changes
3. Content changes
4. Administrative changes
5. Curricular changes

There were the more concrete proposals suggested by teachers. They are seen in the table below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural/Organisational</th>
<th>Methodological</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Curricular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems of evaluation to make it 'fool-proof'</td>
<td>I. ER as a Course</td>
<td>1. *Use comics (T-3), *(T-6)</td>
<td>1. General Library possible (T-11)</td>
<td>1. Nature of change old and new together (T-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with team-teaching, one teacher evaluating in one room, one 'teaching' (T-3)</td>
<td>a) 5-6 teachers in-charge of ER, ER is given a specialised status (T-11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of book read in class, 25% at home (T-2)</td>
<td>b) Teacher reads --books each time --'a worrying factor' (T-7), (T-11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks for progress &amp; development (T-5)</td>
<td>c) Use of card system (T-3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllabus</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) 2 syllabuses - the average and the advanced (T-11)</td>
<td>2. Newspaper reports, captions (T-9), *(T-6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Interactive ER strategies spelt out; ER pedagogy (T-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Levels of objectives (T-6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*III. Role of Teacher-Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Use of library with more teacher supervision (T-10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) T interested listener, St. story teller; reconstructing the story (T-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural/Organisational Methodological Content Administrative Curricular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role of ER</strong></td>
<td><strong>Judicious</strong></td>
<td><strong>2. Economic freedom for students, developing student autonomy and responsibility and therefore teacher responsibility and autonomy. To be built into ER (buying books with own money) (T-10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a service course - inter-departmental co-operation (T-6)</td>
<td>selection of texts presented to students (T-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER as language for life (T-5)</td>
<td>Exploration of St. tastes for inclusion in ER lists (T-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ER as a laboratory</em> (T-11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) T. as researcher: Students' reactions: St. summary used for feedback and planning of ER generalise also (T-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) T. intervention didactic or not? (T-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Pep talk to students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) T. lends respectability to students' reading tastes (T-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. Model of Reading</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Past history of students in reading to be considered (T-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) ER as fluency (T-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Evaluation Qns: (a) read book? (b) like book?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*d) Browsing skills -- not complete book always; skipping, dropping.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) reading not one-one interaction, but group discussions (T-6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All asterisked items introduced by researcher in T-Int.
Teacher theorising yielded specific perceptions on

(a) ER and its boundaries
(b) ER pedagogy and methodology

(Further discussion of table follows in Chapter VI.)

5.3.1 **ER and Its Boundaries (T-Int)**

From the teachers' interviews (T-Int) we get a perspective on what the 'subject' classification of ER could be. This opinion is described as ER across the curriculum, or ER as a service course (column I in Table).

This involves a breaking of subject barriers, of involving all teachers who are interested in the language level of students. The traditional position of ER as a course in the English Department is:

![Fig. 5.1: ER and 'Subject' Boundaries](image)

- **ER as a Course**
  - fiction
  - some non-fiction
  - organised by English Departments

- **Other Subjects**
  - Subject Specials (textbooks mostly)

  Organised by other Departments for **content** not language
If the subject boundaries are broken, if ER is seen as of prime importance as a vehicle for learning in general, then the whole system would be involved.

**Fig. 5.2: ER Across the Curriculum**

- ER
  - fiction
  - non-fiction
  - subject specials
  - literature
  - popular reading
  - organised by English Departments
  - organised by Subject Departments

Collaboration through projects and inter-departmental cooperation.

This idea was suggested in teacher interviews, by one teacher (T-6). Since the idea came up mid-way through the interview sessions, it was an idea that emerged, with the initial teacher interviews and which was subsequently reformulated in later teacher interviews when seen against the curriculum. The notion of collaboration with other subject areas, seemed acceptable theoretically speaking in discussion with teachers who, however, qualified their opinions with objections that reflect the priorities of the hidden curriculum. The main objections raised by teachers to the notion of ER across the curriculum were:
(a) How do English teachers cope with specialised subjects?

(b) The time factor - a lot more effort will be involved.

5.3.2 ER Pedagogy (T-Int)

The ER pedagogy as it emerged, is difficult to categorise in that, it has been recognised that ER as a goal and ER as means are equally valuable as concepts. Keeping actual teacher opinions, however, ER pedagogy emerged as abstracted from the data and can be described/listed below:

B. ER Skills (also can be termed as goals)

i. Browsing: (a) finding books - picking up and dipping-reading blurbs
   (b) comparing books

ii. Skimming - not to read all through or to even complete the book

iii. Skipping back and forth

iv. Selection-students finding their own levels

v. Developing imagination

vi. Developing cultural meanings

Means (classroom methodology)

i. Via process, not product

Therefore diagnostic exercises - do you like it? Why did you stop there? What type of books do you like? reading method?
ii. ER as development - Read a bit, more, more etc. Guided to self-selected texts

iii. Discussion - multiple perspectives - reading as involving the schema, the group, and the teacher

iv. Evaluative discussions: using open type of questions, answers not necessarily required or predictable

v. 75% read in class, 25% at home. Blurbs etc.

vi. Feedback (to be fed into ER programme)

As already mentioned (5.1) the student interviews yielded interesting opinions/suggestions that seem essential to a workable pedagogy. The A and B stream students gave specific suggestions for the goals and means of ER. More indirectly, the C stream students interviewed said why they found the course useful, and this yields many C stream student goals (and means) as well (see 4.1.3 and 5.1.2). These suggestions put together are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ER Goals and Skills</th>
<th>Objectives - for Short term tea- goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How to read a book</td>
<td>Discussion - speaking, listening,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting plurality of meanings</td>
<td>vocabulary development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve &quot;conceptual&quot; level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get exposure to books not picked up naturally by readers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To broaden thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means²

Means < 2
A comparison of student and teacher theorising is interesting. What students consider the ER course achieved, though not articulated as goals to the course are, in fact, means or objectives towards proficiency in English. Here we have a bottom-up analysis of what the skill and goals of ER entails in operation. It is taken as a means to achieve language proficiency - which is mainly communicating, discussion, interaction, negotiation in English. This observation can be considered as highly significant. For while teachers and syllabus-makers and policy-makers have been considering ER as a goal, the students are more practically seeing the ER class as one way of improving language proficiency: more than reading in fact (as a means to a goal). Students see the subject-matter boundaries of ER as being only part of a larger whole, while most teachers keep subject-matter boundaries even for long-term goals that have its reality outside the curriculum, and should not therefore be restricted by curricular subject categorisations.

The aspect of methodology for ER pedagogy, emerged in the interviews by using the theory of ER described in Chapter II, as a "hypothetical" situation was presented for the teachers' consideration. This hypothetical situation was presented generally in the following way:
"Supposing you had a large amount of books - say about 200, and you presented them for the students to choose from and read, pick and choose as they wanted -

(a) How would it work in the classroom?
(b) How would students react, according to you?
(c) How would you as a teacher react?
(d) How would your colleagues react?
(e) Would this 'self-selection' of texts work in your college? Why?"

This question yielded an ER methodology. Although self-selection of texts cannot exist in the present curricular system, it was felt that a change in the teachers' role could help introduce the idea. As said before half of the teachers interviewed do see the possibilities of the teacher's role as a facilitator, of moderator, of guide, coming into the ER programme - given, of course, that the problem of the workload (reading all these books) has been lifted.

Some solutions to that problem have been suggested:

(1) That 4-5 teachers are in charge of ER. That ER gets a specialised status.

(2) That each teacher reads 10 books, and the boys go to the teacher concerned.

Administratively, (1) seems more feasible. It means that those teachers with a conception of the purpose of ER in the curriculum, its purposes across the curriculum, take on this task in a concentrated way. It means seeing the teacher in
ER as more than a librarian or an evaluator, more as a moderator and guide, a resource person as it were. The teacher concern with time, an important influence in the hidden curriculum of operationalising this idea, needs to be considered and these two suggestions certainly take this into account.

The understanding of the teachers on the teacher's role, show different perceptions among teachers - an indication of what is involved if change is to be considered. The twin principles of accommodation and assimilation need to consider this particular teacher self-concept in its position and variety.

If the evaluation session is taken seriously, as a chance for interaction, of negotiation with the student, we are facing a new teacher role, that of "an active listener or interactive listener to the student as a story-teller and that of a guide and source (T-5)." This is not "assumptive teaching" (Marland, 1977) where students' schemas are not considered, but rather a learner-centred methodology. Here, the true sense of autonomy, and freedom as being participation and collaboration rather than representative in nature (Hunter, 1980) emerges.
By re-thinking the teacher's role therefore, we are claiming that there is a need for the teacher, for the teacher's intervention, for the teacher's expertise (in a dual sense of book knowledge, and methodological skill) and hence, of the significance of ER as a 'subject' in the curriculum. The teacher's intervention in ER and role is not however central in nature, but is that of an unobtrusive catalyst.

What conclusions can be drawn from teacher theorising on ER, on how much of Theory I can be feasible in implementation? What seem to be constraints in the 'is' factor, necessary for consideration in further planning? Or in other words, what practical suggestions for ER can be seen?

In terms of content i.e., with reference to ER, the teacher's ideas which have helped to reformulate our theory of reading for the curriculum are:

1. It is important first of all, to consider the resistances to making the teacher deal with a large amount of books (need for assessment therefore necessity to consider the time factor).

2. If there is assessment, then we cannot include the element of pleasure as a requirement to the working definition of ER. We need then to re-work objectives.
If there is no assessment, however, the picture would be totally different, but irrelevant for speculation, since it will not then the within the curriculum, since assessment is a crucial factor in curricular operations.

3. A larger, more judicious collection of books needs to be formed with the students' prior reading tastes. It is not enough or practical however to just have/wide availability of texts; some monitoring of texts is necessary in a curriculum.

4. A more negotiable sort of discussion between students, between teachers and with students and teachers and more group discussion is necessary for deciding input and for influencing reading perspectives.

It is necessary therefore that Theory (I) is adapted by Operations, by forces in the curriculum, for more effective planning of courses and syllabus.

A further point needs to be made here. The suggestion made by teachers in table 5.1 are practical, feasible suggestions, made with the actual working conditions of the curriculum in mind.

These suggestions are mostly the 'first step variety; steps feasible in the teachers' opinion towards larger
changes. Such changes, because they are based on actualities, are developmental in nature, and not static, coming from outside real experience. The pattern is that of 'minimal improvement' and qualitative in nature. The old, authoritarian structures still exist in many teachers - indeed in very young ones - this seems to be the student expectation as well. But if change is at the grass-roots level it is with such minimal structures that new ideas will have to engage.

Conclusion

This section shows an emerging ER pedagogy. (1) where ER itself is examined, and (2) proposals for ER pedagogy emerge through discussion. The hypothetical question of self-selection, provoked some discussion and thought on the teacher's role, and a possible methodology for ER. That learners and teachers can participate in decision-making is demonstrated, in the delineation of skills and goals and means of ER.

What is also demonstrated here, is how teaching methodology can emerge through discussion with a researcher, serving as a catalyst. It is suggested that change can be effected realistically only if the actual situation is considered, and only if the participants are willing to open up and talk (further discussion in Chapter VI).
56. Hypothesis B

In this chapter, we discussed the data, in the light of the second Central Question of the study.

To question B:

Given that the formal system devalues Theory I by contradicting it, what then is the value of the ER course in the curriculum (Theory II and Operations) in relation to the low achiever in English?

Our analysis shows that:

ER with its existing structure has usefulness for the initial stages of development for the low achievers, but has very little practical value for the high achievers. The motivation factors of low achievers moreover, dropped, rather than rose with time. This could be because of uninteresting reading material or difficult 'contracts', or comparisons made with high achievers who were no longer doing ER in the third semester or assessment taking complete control of the ER course. Changes in later semesters for C streamers is necessary and would entail a change in role-relationships between students and teachers, less of a focus on assessment, more of a mixed-ability grouping and opportunities for interaction and a closer shift to Theory I through a 'self-selection' of texts. The instruction of ER in the curriculum, further, requires on the whole, a definite concentration on what an
ER pedagogy might be. In the light of these discussions, then, the following hypothesis has emerged.

**Hypothesis B:**

The ER course has initial instructional value for the low achiever in English which noticeably decreases at later stages. The course has little value for the high achiever even at initial stages.

In the next chapter, in conclusion, we will examine larger questions regarding ER in the curriculum, relevant to our study.
NOTES

1. This finding has some similarity with what Krashen (1982) says of learning and instruction: that the effect of instruction in language is good for beginners, but not good for older groups. (See Krashen, 1985:13, "The Effects of Instruction.")

2. Means: Student and teacher perspectives naturally observe 'means' as different. Teachers are concerned with methodology, what is to be done in class; while students are not concerned with this question primarily.

3. Subject-matter boundaries: The reference here is to boundaries imposed on learning areas by time-tableing. ER could be said to be a distinction brought about by time-tableing; its boundaries defined by constraints of syllabus. The distinction between IR and ER in fact, is that ER involves larger texts; the reading process being the same in IR and ER. The disadvantages of subject matter boundaries are discussed by Postman and Weingartner (1971) and Bruner (1966).
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